

Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Summary

Masters of Business Administration, MBA

*School of Management
2016-2018*

Submitted by: Mark Herrmann
Contact Information: x7461
Date: May 2018

1. Assessment information collected:

A. Communication

- i. Written:** Writing samples collected from a variety of courses that, depending on the year, may include MBA 605 (Contemporary Concepts in Accounting), MBA 617 (Organizational Theory for Managers), MBA 643 (Marketing Management), MBA 673 (Technology Management), MBA 683 (Advanced Topics in Marketing), MBA 690 (Corporate Strategy), and MBA 691 (Advanced Topics in Business).
- ii. Oral:** Oral presentations collected from a variety of courses that, depending on the year, may include MBA 617 (Organization Theory for Managers), MBA 620 (Portfolio Theory and Asset Pricing), MBA 643 (Marketing Management), MBA 683 (Advanced Topics in Marketing), and MBA 690 (Corporate Strategy).

B. Critical Thinking

- i. General:** Presentations collected in MBA 690 (Corporate Strategy).

C. Professionalism

- i. General:** Business Practice Questionnaire administered in MBA 617 (Organizational Theory for Managers).

D. Technical Knowledge

- i. General:** The ETS exam given in MBA 690 (Corporate Strategy).
- ii. Planning:** Class projects collected from a variety of courses that, depending on the year, may include MBA 643 (Marketing Management), MBA 673 (Innovation Management), and MBA 683 (Advanced Topics in Marketing).

Note: Data is collected every semester and assessment is done every two years by faculty. In AY18 the **Critical Thinking** and **Professionalism** categories were assessed.

2. Conclusions drawn from the collected information summarized above:

A. Communication

- i. **Written:** During the AY16 to AY17 time period, students meeting or exceeding expectations, as an average of each of the components, was 87% on 15 student papers.

Percent of Students Achieving Minimal Standards

Categories	AY14-AY15 (prior period)	AY16-AY17
Appropriate Content	85	100
Critical Thinking Evident	85	73
Appropriate for Intended Audience	80	87
Coherence	80	80
Clarity	85	87
Conciseness	95	93
Average	85	87
Number of Papers	20	15

The minimal standard for the written communication (80%) was met overall. The one category where the assessment average was not met was in the “Critical Thinking Evident” category. This was also the category that was not met at the undergraduate level.

- ii. **Oral:** During the AY14 to AY15 time period, students meeting or exceeding expectations, as an average of each of the components, was 98% on 20 student presentations.

Percent of Students Achieving Minimal Standards

Categories	AY14-AY15 (prior period)
Sense of Audience	93
Organization and/or Development	100
Detail to Support Ideas	100
Understanding of Topic	100
Creative efforts/use of technology	100
Clarity of Speech	93
Dress for presentation	100
Average	98
Number of Presentations	20

For the AY16 to AY17 time period, a new rubric was chosen.

Percent of Students Achieving Minimal Standards

Categories		AY16-AY17
Presentation Skills	Speaking and Volume	100
	Speaking and Reading	100
	Mannerisms	90
	Connect with Audience	100
Visual Aids	Readability	93
	Effectiveness	93
	Quantity and Organization	93
Content	Introduction	93
	Coverage of Subject Matter	100
	Conclusion	100
	Questions and Comments	90
Average		96
Number of Presentations		14

During the current assessment period, the percentage of students meeting or exceeding expectations, as an average of each of the categories, was 96% on 14 student presentations.

B. Critical Thinking

- i. **General:** Presentations were collected from MBA 690 (Corporate Strategy) for the AY16 to AY17 time period.

This is the first year that presentations were evaluated for Critical Thinking, rather than the Watson Glaser of years prior. The presentations all featured both an oral component and a related written project. They were then evaluated by the committee using a rubric, and scores were calculated in 5 categories: explanation of issues, evidence, influence of context and assumptions, student's position, and conclusions and related outcomes.

Evaluation of Student Presentations

Categories	AY16-AY17				
	P1	P2	P3	P4	P5
Explanation of Issues	3.6	3	3.3	3.8	3.3
Evidence	3	2.8	3.1	3.2	3.1
Influence of Context	2.6	2.6	2.4	3	3
Position	3.1	3	3.4	3.8	3.2
Conclusions	3.3	3	3.6	3.6	3
Overall Average	3.12	2.88	3.16	3.48	3.12

To achieve the minimal standard, 80% of students had to have an overall average score of 3 as defined by

the rubric. Four of the five evaluated projects earned the requisite score, so the minimal standard was reached.

Overall, students did very well. They scored best in the “explanation of issues” category, with an overall average of 3.4 between all the presentations. However, their overall averages in the “influence of context and assumptions” category was only 2.72, showing that more work needs to be done in this area.

C. Professionalism

- i. **General:** The Business Practice Questionnaire was administered in MBA 617 (Organizational Theory for Managers) for the AY16 to AY17 time period.

Business Practice Questionnaire

Students: 87
Mean: 69%

Min. Standard: 70% of students have “acceptable” scores (as defined by rubric).

The Business Practice Questionnaire (BPQ) was distributed to 87 students during the AY16 to AY17 time period. Those students averaged 69% on the questionnaire, and thus failed to reach the minimal standard.

D. Business Principles

- i. **General Business:** The ETS exam was given in MBA 690 (Corporate Strategy) for the AY16 to AY17 time period.

Percentiles for the ETS Business Exam by Area

Areas	AY15	AY16
Marketing	95	88
Management	85	76
Finance	91	86
Accounting	85	90
Strategic Integration	94	91
Overall- Students	73	71
Overall- School	91	86
Number Students	21	35

These scores reflect Spring 2015 and Spring 2016. At this time, raw scores are in for Fall 2016, but the comparative data is not yet available to calculate percentages. However, the raw Fall 2016 scores look very good.

Forty-four students took the exam during the current cycle and, nationwide, SOM students’ average scores were at the 71st percentile and SOM scored at the 86th percentile as a school.

In terms of specific areas, SOM ranked highest for accounting and strategic integration and lowest for management. The scores between the two assessed periods were similar, but just slightly down in the current assessment period; this may change when the Fall 2016 comparative data comes out, so the raw scores in this time period can be converted to percentiles.

- ii. **Planning:** Class projects were collected from a variety of courses for the AY14 to AY15 time period.

Percent of Students achieving minimal standards

Categories	AY14-AY15 Marketing Plans
Mission and Objectives	70
Situation/Opportunity Analysis	95
Target Market Identification	100
Overall Strategy Formulation	75
Product/Service Description	95
Place/Distribution Channel Consideration	90
Promotion Consideration	95
Price Consideration	95
Average	89
Number of Papers	20

Overall, the students exceeded the minimal standard (80%), falling just slightly short in the categories “Mission and Objectives” and “Overall Strategy Formation.”

With the overall satisfactory score on last cycle’s marketing plans, innovation plans were assessed for the AY16 to AY17 time period.

Percent of Students achieving minimal standards

Categories	AY16-AY17 Innovation Plans
Demonstrated Novelty	80
Demonstrated Utility	90
Demonstrated Feasibility	80
Demonstrated Value	90
Information Usage	70
Report Presentation	85
Average	83
Number of Papers	20

Overall, the students exceeded the minimal standard (80%), falling slightly short in just the category of “Information Usage.”

3. Curricular changes resulting from conclusions drawn above:

A. Communication

- i. Written:** No changes are planned for the written communication assessment.

As the MBA program has moved from mainly an in-class program to mainly an online program, we are pleased that the scores remain similar in both modes of delivery. The one category that was slightly under expectations was the evidence of critical thinking. The critical thinking of the objective for the MBA program is being re-written (see below). We will check next assessment cycle to see if this improves scores for that category.

- ii. Oral:** No changes are planned for the oral communication assessment.

Again, as the MBA program has moved from a largely in-class program to mainly an online program, we are pleased to see that the oral assessed scores have remained well above the minimum requirements. The newly adopted rubric also met with satisfaction among the assessors.

B. Critical Thinking

- i. General:** This was the first year that a new assessment for Critical Thinking was used. Presentations were evaluated using a new rubric, and the minimal standard was met.

The relative newness of this assessment instrument compared to other areas of assessment means that there were very few samples for the AY16 to AY17 period. Therefore, even though the minimal standard was met, the committee would like to exercise caution in enacting any major curriculum changes as a result of the data, until a larger representative sample can be evaluated.

However, the low overall scores in the “Influence of Context” area of evaluation was of some concern. The committee has recommended a meeting with the professor of MBA 690 to consider the assessment instrument more closely against the assignment from which the samples are taken, in order to discuss how the assignment itself aligns with the rubric used in assessment.

Additionally, given the nature of the oral presentation and the written component of the assignment, the written component was found to be more detailed and expansive in terms of critical thinking than the oral presentations. Therefore, for the AY18 to AY19 time period, the committee will use the assessment instrument to evaluate only the written components of the samples, and not the oral presentations.

C. Professionalism

- i. General:** The questionnaire administered in MBA 617 showed that students failed to reach the minimal standard.

Currently, the Business Practice Questionnaire is administered following an assigned article on ethics in business. For the AY18 to AY19 time period, the committee will work to develop another element of accountability for ethical behavior: a professional ethics code. All graduates will be required to sign the code prior to taking the questionnaire. The development of this new code will involve research into examples from other universities, in order to examine both the universities’ code of ethics and the system of consequences in place for any conduct failures. Additionally, it is the committee’s goal that the code will be administered to all incoming MBA students to make them aware of what ethical behavior will be expected from them as they learn at the School of Management. The code will also be discussed in length with the Strategic and Executive Management Committee, and must be met with their approval prior to being administered to the MBA students.

D. Business Principles

- i. General:** The minimal standard for the ETS exam was met during this assessment period.

The School of Management is again very pleased with the results of the ETS MBA Business field exam, especially as the program has moved from primarily in class to largely online. Scored did dip ever so slightly; however, the raw scores for Fall 2016 look very strong. We are just waiting for ETS to publish the comparison data to be able to calculate the percentiles.

- ii. Planning:** The new instrument developed for AY17 showed that students continue to meet the minimal standard.

This is the first time that we have targeted innovation plans for assessment. The overall assessments were strong. The one area that fell under the minimal requirement was “Information Usage.” To address this deficiency, a patent analysis will be added. At least one patent related to students’ creation will be identified and analyzed by students. The analysis results could strengthen the information usage in innovation plans.

4. Identify the faculty members involved in reaching the conclusions drawn above and agreeing upon the resulting curricular changes:

All graduate MBA changes were addressed by the MBA Assurance of Learning Committee which consists of the following members:

Lily Dong, Chair

Haiwei Chen

Ping Lan

Kim McGinnis

Thomas Zhou

Ashley Witt (AOL Support)